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ABSTRACT

The first academic studies of leadership evaluated leadership with dimensions thought to be universal. However, these studies have originated in America and are shaped by that culture. In recent years intercultural leadership studies have revealed a different perspective. These studies have shown that there is cultural diversities about leadership traits and behaviors. In this context, this study was conducted to answer the question “Is it possible to talk about Turkish Type Leader concept by bringing together the behavior dimensions and expectations which come out by the effect of the cultural structure?” In this study emic approach is considered appropriate. The scope of the research interviews with academicians who are experts in their field were performed. The personality characteristics and behaviours which a Turkish type leader should have were evaluated. It has also been studied Turkish type leader’s characteristics and behaviours. Data were analyzed using content analysis of qualitative research methods. According to the findings, it has been determined that with the impact of the cultural and historical characteristics there may be a concept of Turkish Type Leader. Turkish Type leader has an authoritarian and decisive personality, he asks the opinions of his subordinates, but he makes the final decision and expect them to honour his decision while acting like a father to them. He is protecting a certain hierarchical limit. According to the participants the best leader fits to the concept of Turkish Type Leader was identified as Mehmet the Conqueror.

Keywords: Leadership, Culture, Turkish Type Leadership, Mehmet the Conqueror

JEL: M10

Türk Tipi Lider Profili: Akademisyenler Üzerinde Nitel Bir Araştırma

ÖZET

1. INTRODUCTION

Although the phenomenon of leadership emerged with the birth of humanity, academic examination of the concept, began in the twentieth century (Yulk, 2010: 20). There are many studies in the literature conducted to define the concept of leadership, to determine the characteristics which should be owned by the leader/leaders, and to classify the leaders. The most emphasized topics of these studies are the kind of characteristics of an effective leader and their behavior towards their subordinates (Aronson, 2000). The majority of these studies have been done in the western industrialized countries and especially in the United States (US). Although American researchers have developed theories assuming that the current ideas are valid for all cultures many researchers who have studied interculturally have criticized it. The most widely known researcher in the field is Hofstede and he asked the question "Can American theories be applied outside the country?" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). But when leadership theory is viewed as an integral, it has been observed that both the behavior of the leaders in the different communities and the audiences’ expectations have significant differences.

Therefore, the development of the leadership profile is necessarily thought to be enhanced by the universally defined characteristics and behaviours in addition to different characteristics engendered by culture. It is an undeniable fact which is established by numerous studies that culture structure has an impact of shaping the behavior of the leader and the audiences’ expectations. In this context, it is obvious that the structure of the Turkish culture affects the leaders behaviours and the expectations from them. Thus, the main question of this research has been "Is it possible to talk about Turkish Type Leader concept by bringing together the behavior dimensions and expectations which come out by the effect of the cultural structure?"

2. RELATIONSHIP OF CULTURE AND LEADERSHIP

Leaders are people who drags and manipulates the community with different aims and methods (Şencan, İbicioğlu & Karabekir, 2015). The element which separates one community from another is the concept of culture, which is a collective programming of the human thought system (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005: 2). According to Kuchinke (1999) the structure of culture has a significant impact on leadership behavior because in different cultures the efficacy of the leader can be perceived by the audience differently so various leadership styles may become important in different cultures (Giray, 2010). This is supported by many cross-cultural researches.
One of the intercultural studies about leadership is GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness) and it is a large project involving 60 countries including Turkey. Under the project twenty one leadership characteristics have been determined and they are concentrated in six dimensions. Charismatic/value-based leadership (positive) and self-protective leadership (negative) has been found to be universal characteristics for effective leadership. Team orientation, participation, personal focusing and autonomy are defined as characteristics that vary from culture to culture (House, et al., 2001). Under the project 21 countries are separated as North/West (Britain, Denmark, Finland, Germany, etc.) and South/East (France, Italy, Turkey, Russia, etc.). According to the results obtained the participants in South/East Europe countries including Turkey are found to be managerial competent, diplomatic, self-protective, operational and non-participatory leaders whereas leaders in Northern/Western countries have shown to be integrative and inspiring (Koopman, Den Hartog & Konrad, 1999). According to the results obtained in Turkey in which the South/East participants with managerial competence in European countries, diplomatic, self-protective, showing the operational and non-participatory leadership; Northern/Western countries have shown for those in integrative and inspiring characteristics (Koopman, Den Hartog & Konrad, 1999). Again in the study of Kabasakal and Dastmalchian (2001) which is under the scope GLOBE Project; it is shown that the group including Iran, Qatar, Kuwait and Turkey is supportive, visionary and charismatic which are universally regarded leadership characteristics. In particular, by the effect of the original cultural structures it has been identified that paternalistic leadership is seen in Turkey. In another study in which the Arab group of countries including Turkey, Egypt, Qatar, Kuwait are examined, it has been found that team focused and charismatic leadership is the most influential; self focused leadership is less efficient, self-protective and autonomous leadership is negative (Kabasakal & Bodur, 2002). Similarly for Turkey it has been determined that the most effective leadership is team-oriented and charismatic. In another study comparing Turkey, Canada, USA, Romania, Germany, Israel, Russia, China, Pakistan and India, Turkey's pathernalism, power distance and community loyalty leadership dimensions were identified as highly rated (Aycan, et al., 2000).

The study of Aktas (2006) comparing Turkish and American leaders has shown that the Turks have mostly adopted the "Executive Leader" and "Participant Leader" style, whereas the Americans have mostly adopted the "Individualist Leader and "Competitive negotiated Leader" style. In another study comparing Turkish and US leaders have shown that the Turkish leaders have significantly higher scores in individual sensitivity and ideal effect size. It was also revealed that the impact of cultural differences and value orientations have effect on leadership style (Ercan & Sigri, 2015).

In the light of studies it has been shown that culture has undeniable impact on the leadership style and when assessing the culture of Turkey a leader type can be determined with common characteristics that can be called "Turkish Type Leadership". Several studies on this subject in Turkey supports this prediction. In Kuzugil's study (2009) covering six geographical regions which aims to examine Turk's thoughts on leadership and their ideal leadership dimensions findings reveal the existence of an implicit leadership theory specific to Turkey. According to the survey the most preferred and expected type of leadership in Turkey
is paternalistic leadership and secondly is diplomatic leadership. Aggressiveness is the least expected behaviour from a leader by Turkish people. Atan (2010) has determined the most preferred leadership style as “interactive leadership” in Turkey and has stated that in the current situation the most seen leadership is “proactive leadership”.

Canbolat and colleagues (2010) studied over the Turkish leadership profile by examining Turkish political leaders and stated that leadership identity in Turkey is determined by the set of social values together with the generally accepted norms. As a result of studies Turkish leaders was determined to have paternalistic behaviours under the influence of cultural. On the other hand Özgül’s (2015) study accepting Turkey as a universe, according to data obtained from the 35 provinces, political leader type who is mostly expected by the people is identified as the type of transformational leadership.

Another study claimed that cultural dimensions of the Turkish construction sector coincide with Turkey’s national cultural structure according to the Hofstede’s culture dimensions. In this study it has been shown that participants favored democratic participatory leaders but on the contrary, they experience the autocratic leader mostly (Yenipazarlı, 2006).

3. METHOD

Although methods used in disciplines such as mathematics and science remains inadequate for researching human behavior, it can be only be evaluated by a flexible and a holistic perspective. Various disciplines, moving from this viewpoint give importance to qualitative study in a different way from traditional research methods (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011: 35-36). When the type of leadership evolving under the influence of Turkey’s culture is examined the use of qualitative design was deemed appropriate.

On the other hand in the intercultural studies there is a methodic question to use Emics (inside view) or Ethics (outside view) methods. This distinction was first put forward by Pike (1967) and it has led to debate among researchers (Sargut, 2001: 85). Emics behavior approach is defined according to a view from the people living inside the culture and their own understanding. The ethical approach is to identify from outside and the results are assumed to be fully implemented in another culture (Morris, et al., 1999). In this study a structured questionnaire with open-ended questions which were not primarily affected by any culture were used. It is then evaluated ethically with the universally accepted ethical leadership theories. It is considered to avoid the current problem with this method called derived ethics in the literature (Berry, et al., 1992).

In the scope of this research academics has been recognized as the universe. During the creation of the sample the purposive sampling method was used to have a pool of academics who are working on issues such as leadership, culture, Turkish culture and Turkish history and from volunteers a sample of seventeen people were selected. The interviews were done in selected samples. Some of them were done face to face and some interviews were conducted on internet. According to Briggs (1986) interview method is a very effective method for learning the individuals’ experiences, attitudes, opinions, and beliefs so it is the most commonly used method for research in the social sciences (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011: 35-36)
119). For the same reason interview method has been approved for use in this research and interviews were conducted in a structured questionnaire axis.

In the questionnaire form some questions were asked. If Turkish type Leader concept will be mentioned, if it will be mentioned what personality traits the Turkish type leader has or should have, how should she/he behave towards their subordinates and how she/he behaves, finally, who is the most suitable leader in this concept questions were asked. The data obtained from the questions were evaluated using qualitative research methods like content analysis and descriptive analysis. Descriptive analysis is a systematic way of giving direct quotations and interpretation to reflect the interviewed people’s ideas dramatically (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011: 224). The content analysis encodes the data in order to uncover concepts and themes that can not be realized by descriptive analysis and it provides systematical interpretation of similar codes under a theme (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011: 227).

So in this research to define the "Turkish Type Leader" concept the characteristics and behaviors are coded under the appropriate themes. Also some necessary negotiation texts were quoted directly.

4. FINDINGS

For the study seventeen voluntary academics of Suleyman Demirel University who have studies on issues such as management, leadership, culture, Turkish culture and Turkish history were chosen as sample. Demographic data of the participants are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthdate</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-1970</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1980</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1990</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akademic Title</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Asistant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected sample is first divided into two groups. The first group consists of 10 academicians including 6 research asistants and 4 lecturers. The second group consists of 7 academicians including 3 assistant professors 2 associate professors and 2 professors. The purpose of this group selection is to identify academicians’ expectations from Turkish Type Leader at the first group meetings and because the second group is including more academically experienced participants to identify their thoughts and observations about the Turkish Type Leader’s common characteristics and his behavior.

In both groups, the first question asked in the interviews was "Do you think the concept of Turkish Type leader can be mentioned?" Only two participants (one research
assistant and one associate professor) gave the answer "No". When asked why they said no to that question, they answered:

P.6: "Leadership which is generally accepted to be institutionalized should be valid for us too. Turkish Type sounds as if we are speaking of an autocratic structure. So no."

From this answer we understand this person actually has a judgment about the concept of Turkish Type Leader. But this judgment is stated as "autocrat" and because this phrase is considered to be a negative associative concept he is avoiding from identification. So in fact the participant has been found to encode the "Turkey Type Leader" as 'autocrat'.

The participant in the second group said:

P.14: "No, because Turkish leaders have many variable and uncommon features. In addition to that, people's expectations and attitudes are very variable."

This approach is a generally accepted idea for the leadership researchs, but the main aim of this study is to identify common characteristics, common expectations and attitudes. However, there is no claim that all leaders in Turkey are Turkish Type leaders or they should be. There are different types of leaders in Turkey's society like every society. But because of the influence of cultural structure there are some common attitudes and behaviors in the society and society is thought to have some common expectations.

On the other side the other 15 academicians interviewed as part of research, answered the question "Do you think the concept of Turkish Type Leader can be mentioned?" as "Yes". Referring to the statements made by participants we understand that cultural structure and history of Turkey has caused this perspective. The basic assumption and exit point of this study is the question of "Can a Turkish Type Leadership concept that brings together the dimensions of behavior which appeared under the influence of the culture and the expectations mentioned?". So this question is partially supported at this point.

P.4: "Yes. It can be mentioned. There is a type of leader based on the Turkish culture and history."

P12 "It can be mentioned. Because of the history and unique cultural texture it is possible to talk about the concept of Turkish type of leader."

P. 15: "Yes. Because of our cultural code of leadership poses difference from other cultures."

P.17: "If you agree to the Ottoman as a Turkish style leader I say yes."

In the first group interviews with participants the question "What personality traits do you think Turkish Type Leader should have?" was asked. The answers received were
decoded and subjected to content analysis. Data obtained by coding of the expressions are given in Table 2.

### Table 2. Expected Personality Traits of TTL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Personality Traits of TTL</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic And Strong Eloquence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate And Humble</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable On Cultural And Religious Values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brilliant and Competent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable and Honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking and Selfless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we look at the most expected personality traits of Turkish Type Leader (TTL) by the academicians the most coded phrase is found to be "authoritarian" (15.39%). According to Hofstede’s research Turkey is located between the countries with high power distance (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005: 43). In these cultures leaders are expected to have more authority, leaders are known as people whose directives needs to be done without questioning (Dickson, Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003). In this regard Turkey's expectations from the leader by the effect of culture is that she/he shows her/his authority by using her/his eloquence and charisma which will put the society into motion. On the other hand in high power distance societies and in developing countries a paternalistic but supporting autocratic leadership style is generally preferred (Dorfman et al., 1997). Academicians in the survey most repeatedly used "charismatic and strong eloquence" (11.54%) and "paternalistic" (11.54%) codes as the characteristics of TTL. This behaviour also supports that notion. Moreover Hofstede's (2005: 129) research showed that due to Turkish culture’s female characteristics "Compassionate and Humble" (11.54%) code has been one of the most anticipated characteristics. This behaviour also supports the notion. "Dependable on cultural and religious values" (11.54%) code which expresses the expectation of a leader who knows the Turkish culture well, can analyze it well and who is spiritually strong is thought to have a high importance of group commitment and social identity as in the Hofstede’s research (Hofstede& Hofstede, 2005: 79). Turkish people’s passion on Turkish Nationalism, history and religion can also be evaluated in this direction. "Decisive", "Equitable", "Brilliant and Competent ", "Inclusive", "Reliable and honest" and "Hardworking and Selfless" codes have been identified as the other characteristics expected from TTL.

Another question posed to the participants in the first group interview was "How do you think Turkish Type Leader should behave to their subordinates (the followers)?". The data obtained is shown below in Table.3 which is formed by coding of the available data.
Table 3. Expected Behaviors of TTL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Behaviors of TTL</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic-Looking Autocratic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly and Humble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Produce Strategic Solutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for Motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toplam</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... “He should be like my dad sometimes he should get upset, sometimes he should warm, sometimes he should love, such as the approach of the father to the child ...", "... He should be strict enough to make the job done, he should be soft enough to chat ...", "... both beating and loving style. Like a hard punch covered with cotton ...". Statements like above were encoded as “Paternalistic” (29.41%) and they were the most anticipated behaviors of the TTL. In collectivist and high power distance cultures paternalistic leader approach which concerns his subordinates’ private life and their comfort but in return expects unconditional obedience and respect seems to be a common leadership approach (Köksal, 2011). In this context, it is supported that the academicians under the impact of Turkish culture anticipate paternalism on the first place in TTL’s behavior to his subordinates. Secondly, the behavior expected from TTL was coded as "Tolerant" (17.65%). "Democratic-looking autocratic” (11.76%) code and "Fair” (11.76%) code were used to describe the autocratic behavior which drew a democratic image by taking the ideas of subordinates, but taking the actual decision by himself was the most anticipated other behaviors. In this context according to Aycan (2002) the ideal leadership characteristics in the developing countries such as paternalism, participant but also stable, giving employees the feeling that they are strong, to be fair among employees, being humble has similarities to the expected TTL behavioral characteristics. On the other hand "To produce strategic solutions," "Strong communication", "Compensation for motivation" and "Collectivist" codes are defined as other behaviors expected from the TTL.

In the second phase of the study a group consisting of 7 expert academicians were interviewed. During the interview the question "What personality traits do you think Turkish Type Leader has?" was asked to the participants. Encodings obtained by analyzing the responses given are shown in Table 4.
Table 4. TTL’s Personality Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TTL’s Personality Characteristics</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Harmonious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divider</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading / Guiding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially neurotic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the group consisting of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors who are expert at subjects like management, leadership, culture, Turkish culture and Turkish history, "authoritarian" (20.83%) code comes in the first place of the personality characteristics TTL has. When this case is evaluated together with the situation that in the first part of the study "Authoritarian" was in the first place of TTL’s expected characteristics it can be thought that "authoritarian" concept can be used in the definition of TTL. Secondly the most repeated code is "Paternalistic" (12.50%) so it can be used in TTL definition. The "Decisive" (12.50%) expression which is coded as to see everything permissible on the road to the goal and being stable on ideals is thought to be in the third rank of identifying the TTL.

On the other hand because of "Egocentric" (% 8,33) feature (coded as self gain and statements that he puts his aims on the foreground) and "Natural and harmonious" (58.33) feature (natural and spontaneous acting and adaptation to the changing environment) wasn’t reconciled with the expected characteristics of TTL, they are not considered to be appropriate for defining TTL. Also “Divider” (8.33%) (they adopt a certain group and exclude other social groups) conflicts with "Inclusive" characteristics (expected from TTL and coded by using different participants), so both of them cannot be used for defining TTL. "Leading/Guiding", "Extrovert", "Responsible", "Openness to experience", "Brave" and "Partially neurotic" codes are considered to be characteristics which change from person to person and they are characteristics which cannot be generalized so they cannot be used in TTL definition.

Another question asked to the second group was "How do you think Turkish Type Leader behaves his subordinates (the follower)?". Encoded version of the data obtained are given in Table 5.
Table 5. TTL’s Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TTL’s Behavior</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He takes the idea but does things as he wish and and expects obedience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He does not just make the subordinates work but he becomes an example for others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results most coded phrase about the TTL’s behaviour to their subordinates was "He takes the idea but does things as he wish and and expects obedience" (30% ). These statements are compatible with the expected behavior of the TTL’s coded as "Democratic-looking autocratic " behavior. So the use of this phrase in defining TTL has been considered appropriate. In addition, "Authoritarian" (20%), "Paternalistic" (20%) and "Hierarchical relationship" (20%) codes are both compatible with expected behavior and characteristics of the TTL so it is found to be suitable for use in identifying TTL. "He does not just make the subordinates work but he becomes an example for others" phrase has not been considered appropriate to define the TTL because it did not find support.

The last question asked to participants in both groups is " Who do you think best fits the concept of leading Turkish Type Leader?". According to academicians involved in the research among the leaders best fitting the TTL concept the Mehmet the Conqueror (4) is ranked first, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk (2), Recep Tayyip Erdogan (2) and the Ottoman Sultans (2) are in the second place. Sakip Sabanci, Fatih Terim, Vehbi Koç and Devlet Bahçeli were coded once and said to fit in the TTL concept. Two academicians said that there can’t be a TTL concept and one did not respond to the question.

5. CONCLUSION

In the academic literature with the intercultural leadership studies it has been shown that different leadership styles are effective and expected in different cultures. From various studies it has also been determined that there is an implicit theory of leadership special for Turkish culture. From this study done to understand if there can be Turkish Type Leader (TTL) concept has been defined according to the perspective of academicians.

According to the study results it is understood that the majority of scholars believe it may be mentioned in TTL concept due to cultural and historical structure. When we look at the response of academicians who said this concept can not be mentioned we see one academician defined TTL as "autocratic" but because of its negative meaning he did not use it. On the other hand it was said that because of various expections and behaviour patterns TTL can not be mentioned. According to data obtained from this research the views of participants differed but the opinion that there are some common characteristics of the leader has been found to be more dominant. Also in this study, which is done with academicians,
expected personality characteristics of the TTL and their behavior towards subordinates have been identified.

Personality traits expected from TTL by the academicians surveyed are coded as "Authoritarian", "Paternalistic", "Compassionate and Humble", "Dependable on cultural and religious values", "Decisive", "Equitable", "Brilliant and Competent", "Inclusive", "Reliable and honest" and "Hardworking and Selfless". This situation is compatible with the fact that Turkey’s power distance is high, has feminine characteristics and has a collectivist society. On the other hand the primarily expected behaviors towards TTL’s subordinates are coded as "Paternalistic", "Tolerant", "Democratic-looking autocratic" and "Fair". There is also a TTL expectation who can produce strategic solutions for problems, who is friendly and humble, who has strong communication skills, who is rewarding and motivating subordinates and has collectivist thinking.

In the second phase of the research observations of expert academicians about TTL's personality traits and his behavior towards subordinates were evaluated. The findings were evaluated together and the usage of ones matching consistently were found eligible for use. A leader type coded by character characteristics like "Authoritarian," "Paternalistic," "Decisive" and a leader type whose relationships with his subordinates are "Hierarchical Relationship" and "Democratic-looking Autocratic" are determined as the leader type. As a result, from the viewpoint of academicians who participated in the study; TTL has an authoritarian tough and determined stance, she/he consults to her/his subordinates, but gives the final decision herself/himself and expects to obeyed. TTL has a sweet rigid behaviour type to his subordinates, she/he takes care of their problems in their private life as a father (or mother) but also determines the border clearly and does not allow the deterioration of the hierarchy. Within participants as being a leader in the TTL concept "Mehmet the Conqueror" was put in the first position.

As a result of studies it was intended to define a new concept in the literature and in the light of data obtained the Turkish Type Leader identification was developed. Because research topics are related to human behavior whose examination and evaluation are difficult the use of qualitative design has been used and interviews with expert academicians in the field have been made. However, a major limitation of the study is that samples were selected only from a single university. The extension of samples can provide more comprehensive results and a more current definition can be made. Also new studies with the universe outside of academics, with bureaucrats, executives and Turkish people are expected to contribute to literature.
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